

**Lee Sim - Re: Baker**

---

**From:** Kerry Carpenter  
**To:** "JPMecowrit@aol.com".MAIL.MNET  
**Date:** 03/19/2002 11:16 AM  
**Subject:** Re: Baker

---

Jim:

In response to your questions, below:

1. It does not appear that there are any "recreation" or "fish culture" rights associated with Baker. The reservoir has an authorized storage capacity of 1145.8 acre-feet, divided as 500 AF to Central Canal & Irrigation, 350 AF to Veyo Irrigation, 250 AF to Gunlock Irrigation, and 45.8 AF to Lee Hirschi (may have been sold, but nothing filed with this office). I find no references to a "conservation pool" in the dam records, typically an indicator that other uses are supported.

The primary water right, 81-134, lists irrigation and power generation as the beneficial uses (the Sand Cove and Gunlock plants, I believe). A second right, 81-2253 owned by Veyo Irrigation Co., describes only irrigation use.

Because the main storage right under 81-134 carries a relatively late priority date (06/24/1936), water can generally only be diverted for storage when the river's flow is sufficient to satisfy all prior direct-flow rights.

2. I'm not sure what Stuart and Claude mean by saying that the irrigators don't have any water yet, but they may be referring to priority dates. Or something else. ... Rod Leavitt could probably tell you more about that. Normally, releases of water from Baker this time of year would only occur if flows were exceptionally high and there was a need to limit spillway discharges. However, this is not a normal year. There probably won't be any spill, so the stored water is likely being held until the natural stream flows are lower.

3. Finally, regarding stockholders, with the exception of Lee Hirschi's shares, it is my understanding that the shares are all owned by other companies, not by individuals. By extrapolation, all the shareholders in the owner companies would also hold interest in the Baker Reservoir Company.

I will readily admit that I don't have an "off the cuff" understanding of how Baker fits in to the larger distribution scheme on the Santa Clara. Our office relies on Rod and Jay Leavitt to know the day-to-day details.

Hope this helps. . .some.

Kerry

>>> <JPMecowrit@aol.com> 03/19/02 06:43AM >>>

Kerry,

I spoke with Stuart Bowler the other day. He seems like a nice fellow. Doesn't seem to mind my querying him from time to time about things pertaining to operating the dam. I offered to learn how it works and provide back up if he's interested.

Had a question for you. Does the state own any water, for recreation, in Baker, or is all of the water some form of irrigation?

I had called Stuart to ask when he might be opening the dam and he indicated that he'd been told that the irrigators didn't have any water yet. Claude told me the same thing. I had not heard this before and was under the impression that it is all irrigation water.

I'd also be interested in knowing who owns the shares in Baker. I must say that I did not quite understand the controversy last fall and I'd like to watch the water delivery with more attentiveness to this sort of thing.

I have the river gaged you know. If there's any way that I can provide assistance to you and these fellows, I'd like to do that.

Thanks,

Jim

James P. McMahon  
 Ecologist/Writer  
 PO Box 3105  
 St. George, UT 84771  
 435-574-2711